

BUHEP-97-8
 hep-ph/9703233

PROGRESS ON SYMMETRY BREAKING AND GENERATIONAL MIXING IN TOPCOLOR-ASSISTED TECHNICOLOR

KENNETH LANE

*Department of Physics, Boston University,
 590 Commonwealth Ave, Boston, MA 02215, USA*

Topcolor-assisted technicolor provides a dynamical explanation for electroweak and flavor symmetry breaking and for the large mass of the top quark without unnatural fine tuning. I briefly review the basics of topcolor-assisted technicolor, including major constraints and a general approach to satisfying them. The main challenge to topcolor-assisted technicolor is to generate the observed mixing between heavy and light generations while breaking the strong topcolor interactions near 1 TeV. I argue that these phenomena, as well as electroweak symmetry breaking, are intimately connected and I present a scenario for them based on nontrivial patterns of technifermion condensation. I also exhibit a class of models realizing this scenario.

1 Introduction

This is the written version of my talk at the 1996 Workshop in Nagoya on Strongly Coupled Gauge Theories (SCGT 96) on the status of models of topcolor-assisted technicolor (TC2).^a This topic is in its infancy, and I believe that much development lies ahead. Thus, this report must be viewed as preliminary. At the same time, I hope it will stimulate study and resolution of many of the problems that TC2 faces.

This report has the following plan: In Sec. 2, I review the basics of the “simplest” TC2 model discussed by Chris Hill at this workshop. Then, in Sec. 3, I summarize the principal constraints on this early version of TC2 model-building. The response to these constraints is outlined in Sec. 4. This response did not resolve satisfactorily the mechanism by which the third generation quarks mix with those of the first two generations. It touched not at all on the question of how the color and hypercharge groups of the heavy and light generations break down to their diagonal subgroup, the familiar $SU(3) \otimes U(1)_Y$. These problems are addressed in Sec. 5; the discussion there is the heart of this paper. As I said, this work is still very much under development.

^aA few of the remarks here will be new, reflecting work done since the SCGT 96 Workshop.

2 Review of Hill's Simplest Topcolor-Assisted Technicolor Model

Topcolor-assisted technicolor (TC2) was proposed by Hill^{1,2} to overcome shortcomings of top-condensate models of electroweak symmetry breaking^{3,4} and of technicolor models of dynamical electroweak and flavor symmetry breaking.^{5,6,7} Technicolor and extended technicolor (ETC) have been unable to provide a natural and plausible understanding of why the top quark mass is so large.⁸ On the other hand, models in which strong topcolor interactions drive top-quark condensation *and* electroweak symmetry breaking are unnatural. To reproduce the one-Higgs-doublet standard model consistent with precision electroweak measurements (especially of the parameter $\rho = M_W^2/M_Z^2 \cos^2 \theta_W \simeq 1$), the topcolor energy scale must be much greater than the electroweak scale of $\mathcal{O}(1 \text{ TeV})$. This requires severe fine tuning of the topcolor coupling.

Hill's combination of topcolor and technicolor keeps the best of both schemes. In TC2, technicolor interactions at the scale $\Lambda_{TC} \simeq \Lambda_{EW} \simeq 1 \text{ TeV}$ are mainly responsible for electroweak symmetry breaking. Extended technicolor is still required for the hard masses of all quarks and leptons *except* the top quark. Topcolor produces a large top condensate, $\langle \bar{t}t \rangle$, and all but a few GeV of $m_t \simeq 175 \text{ GeV}$. This remaining portion of m_t *must* be generated by ETC interactions in order that the Nambu-Goldstone bosons—top-pions—associated with top condensation acquire appreciable masses. Hill has pointed out that some, perhaps all, of the bottom quark mass may arise from $SU(3)_1$ instantons.¹ Top condensation contributes comparatively little to electroweak symmetry breaking. Thus, the scale of topcolor can be lowered to near 1 TeV and the interaction requires little or no fine tuning.

In Hill's simplest TC2 model,¹ there are separate color and weak hypercharge gauge groups for the heavy third generation of quarks and leptons and for the two light generations. He assumed that the third generation transforms under *strongly-coupled* $SU(3)_1 \otimes U(1)_1$ with the usual charges, while the light generations transform in the usual way under *weakly-coupled* $SU(3)_2 \otimes U(1)_2$. By some as yet unspecified mechanism, these four groups are broken near the electroweak energy scale of about 1 TeV to the diagonal subgroup of ordinary color and hypercharge, $SU(3) \otimes U(1)_Y$. The desired pattern of condensation for the third generation occurs because the $U(1)_1$ couplings are such that the spontaneously broken $SU(3)_1 \otimes U(1)_1$ interactions are supercritical for the top quark, but not for the bottom quark (and certainly not for the tau lepton).

Nothing is said in this scenario about how topcolor breaks. Nor is there any mention of how third generation quarks mix with and, hence, decay to those of the first two generations. Topcolor-assisted technicolor is natural in the scenario presented so far. The question is: can its naturalness be main-

tained in a more realistic model, one that accounts for topcolor breaking and generational mixing?

3 Constraints on Topcolor-Assisted Technicolor

Two important constraints were imposed on TC2 soon after Hill's proposal was made. The first is due to Chivukula, Dobrescu and Terning (CDT).⁹ A small part of the top-quark mass must arise from ETC interactions and CDT assumed, plausibly, that at least some of the bottom-quark mass does as well. If, as CDT further assumed, these hard masses arise from (t, b) couplings to the *same* doublet of techni fermions, then the latter must have custodial-isospin violating couplings to the strong $U(1)_1$. To keep $\rho \simeq 1$, they then showed that the $U(1)_1$ interaction must be so weak that it is necessary to fine-tune the $SU(3)_1$ coupling to within 1% of its critical value for top condensation *and* to increase the topcolor boson mass above 4.5 TeV. Thus, TC2 seemed to be unnatural after all. CDT did state that their bounds could be relaxed if $U(1)_1$ couplings did not violate isospin. However, they expected that this would be difficult to implement because of the requirements of canceling gauge anomalies and of allowing mixing between the third and first two generations. As we shall see, the difficult issue will be the intergenerational mixing.

The second constraint on TC2 is due to Kominis.¹⁰ He pointed out that, under the likely assumption that the b -quark's topcolor interactions are not far from critical, there will be relatively light, $M \simeq 250$ -350 GeV, scalar bound states of $\bar{t}_L b_R$ and $\bar{b}_L b_R$. These scalars couple strongly ($\propto m_t$) to third generation quarks. Thus, they can induce potentially large $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing. Kominis showed that the measured value of $\Delta M_{B_d^0}/M_{B_d^0}$ implies the upper bound

$$|D_{Lbd}^d D_{Lbb}^d D_{Rbd}^d D_{Rbb}^d| \lesssim 10^{-7} \quad (1)$$

on elements of the unitary matrices which diagonalize the (generally nonhermitian) $Q = -\frac{1}{3}$ quark mass matrix. If, as we shall make plausible later, the elements of the Kobayashi-Maskawa (KM) matrix connecting the third generation to the first two arise mainly from mixing in the $Q = -\frac{1}{3}$ sector, then this limit can be compared to $|D_{Lbd}| \simeq |V_{ub}| \simeq 0.002$ -0.005, while $|D_{Lbb}| \simeq 1$. Mixing will have to be extraordinarily small in the right-handed-down sector if Kominis' constraint is to be satisfied.

4 Natural Topcolor-Assisted Technicolor

The questions of isospin violation and naturalness raised by CDT were addressed by Eichten and me.^{11,12} We proposed that *different* techni fermion

Table 1: Quark and technifermion hypercharges and electric charges in the TC2 models of Ref. [11]. The $U(1)_1$ hypercharges x_i, y_i, z_i are given in the text.

Particle	Y_1	Y_2	$Q = T_3 + Y_1 + Y_2$
q_L^l	0	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{2}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}$
c_R, u_R	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$
d_R, s_R	0	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$
q_L^h	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	$\frac{2}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}$
t_R	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{2}{3}$
b_R	$-\frac{1}{3}$	0	$-\frac{1}{3}$
T_L^l	x_1	x_2	$\pm\frac{1}{2} + x_1 + x_2$
U_R^l	x_1	$x_2 + \frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2} + x_1 + x_2$
D_R^l	x_1	$x_2 - \frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2} + x_1 + x_2$
T_L^t	y_1	y_2	$\pm\frac{1}{2} + y_1 + y_2$
U_R^t	$y_1 + \frac{1}{2}$	y_2	$\frac{1}{2} + y_1 + y_2$
D_R^t	$y_1 + \frac{1}{2}$	$y_2 - 1$	$-\frac{1}{2} + y_1 + y_2$
T_L^b	z_1	z_2	$\pm\frac{1}{2} + z_1 + z_2$
U_R^b	$z_1 - \frac{1}{2}$	$z_2 + 1$	$\frac{1}{2} + z_1 + z_2$
D_R^b	$z_1 - \frac{1}{2}$	z_2	$-\frac{1}{2} + z_1 + z_2$

isodoublets, T^t and T^b , give ETC mass to the top and bottom quarks. These doublets then could have different $U(1)_1$ charges which, however, were isospin-conserving for the right as well as left-handed parts of each doublet.^b Thus, there was no reason why the $U(1)_1$ coupling g'_1 could not be large, hence no need to fine-tune the $SU(3)_1$ coupling g_1 .

The fermion content of the “natural TC2” models is given in Table 1. In these models, quarks get their ETC mass by coupling to doublet technifermions

^bWhile this eliminates the large value of $\rho - 1$ that concerned CDT, there remain small, $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$, contributions from Z - Z' mixing.

$T^{l,t,b}$ via the $SU(2) \otimes U(1)_Y$ -invariant interactions terms

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_{\bar{u}_i u_j} &= \frac{g_{ETC}^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{q}_{iL}^l \gamma^\mu T_L^l \bar{U}_R^l \gamma_\mu u_{jR} + \text{h.c.} \\
\mathcal{H}_{\bar{d}_i d_j} &= \frac{g_{ETC}^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{q}_{iL}^l \gamma^\mu T_L^l \bar{D}_R^l \gamma_\mu d_{jR} + \text{h.c.} \\
\mathcal{H}_{\bar{t} t} &= \frac{g_{ETC}^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{q}_L^h \gamma^\mu T_L^h \bar{U}_R^t \gamma_\mu t_R + \text{h.c.} \\
\mathcal{H}_{\bar{b} b} &= \frac{g_{ETC}^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{q}_L^h \gamma^\mu T_L^h \bar{D}_R^b \gamma_\mu b_R + \text{h.c.}
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here, g_{ETC} and M_{ETC} stand for generic ETC couplings and gauge boson mass matrices. Also, $q_{iL}^l = (u_i, d_i)_L$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $q_L^h = (t, b)_L$. The technifermions are color-singlets and transform under $SU(N)$ technicolor as the fundamental (N). The assignments of the $U(1)_1$ and $U(1)_2$ hypercharges, Y_1 and Y_2 , for the quarks and technifermions are listed in Table 1 in terms of six parameters ($x_{1,2}; y_{1,2}; z_{1,2}$). The strong $U(1)_1$ couplings of the right and left-handed technifermions are isospin symmetric.

The technifermion hypercharges x_i, y_i, z_i were fixed by requiring that all $U(1)$ gauge anomalies cancel and that the $U(1)$ gauge symmetries permit ETC four-fermion terms to (i) produce quark hard masses (Eq. 2), (ii) induce generational mixing, and (iii) give mass to all Nambu-Goldstone bosons except those involved in the electroweak Higgs process. Note that we did *not* exhibit an explicit ETC model to generate the four-fermion terms. The best we can do at this stage is to assume that all four-fermion operators allowed by the gauge symmetries exist.

For the purposes of this paper, the most important part of determining the hypercharges was the selection of a four-technifermion (4T) operator to induce generational mixing. Working in a “standard” chiral-perturbative ground state in which technifermion condensates are diagonal, $\langle \bar{T}_L^i T_R^j \rangle \propto \delta_{ij}$, we found four possible 4T operators:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_{l t t b} &= \frac{g_{ETC}^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{T}_L^l \gamma^\mu T_L^t \bar{D}_R^t \gamma_\mu D_R^b + \text{h.c.} \\
\mathcal{H}_{b t t l} &= \frac{g_{ETC}^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{T}_L^b \gamma^\mu T_L^t \bar{D}_R^t \gamma_\mu D_R^l + \text{h.c.} \\
\mathcal{H}_{l b b t} &= \frac{g_{ETC}^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{T}_L^l \gamma^\mu T_L^b \bar{U}_R^b \gamma_\mu U_R^t + \text{h.c.} \\
\mathcal{H}_{t b b l} &= \frac{g_{ETC}^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{T}_L^t \gamma^\mu T_L^b \bar{U}_R^b \gamma_\mu U_R^l + \text{h.c.}
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

These operators have the potential to induce the transitions $b_R \longleftrightarrow s_L, d_L$; $b_L \longleftrightarrow s_R, d_R$; $t_R \longleftrightarrow c_L, u_L$; and $t_L \longleftrightarrow u_R, c_R$, respectively.

The mixing that we do know about between the third and the first two generations is contained in the KM matrix for left-handed quarks. It is $|V_{cb}| \simeq |V_{ts}| \simeq 0.03\text{--}0.05 \sim m_s/m_b$ and $|V_{ub}| \simeq |V_{td}| \simeq 0.002\text{--}0.015 \sim \sin \theta_C m_s/m_b$.¹³ A nonzero mixing term $\delta m_{sb} \sim m_s$ in the $\bar{s}_L b_R$ element of the quark mass matrix is needed to produce mixing of this magnitude. Recalling the way in which quark masses are generated in Eq. 2, only $\mathcal{H}_{l t t b}$ has the correct flavor and chiral structure to generate this kind of δm_{sb} . In effect, this operator induces a mixing in the technifermion condensates so that $\langle \bar{D}_L^i D_R^j \rangle \neq 0$.

Requiring the operator $\mathcal{H}_{l t t b}$ and sufficient additional ones to give needed masses to Nambu-Goldstone bosons, we obtained just two solutions for the hypercharges:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{A :} \quad & x_1 = -\frac{1}{2}, & y_1 = 0, & z_1 = \frac{1}{2}, \\ & x_2 = \frac{1}{2}, & y_2 = 0, & z_2 = -\frac{1}{2}; \\ \text{B :} \quad & x_1 = 0, & y_1 = -1, & z_1 = 1, \\ & x_2 = 0, & y_2 = 1, & z_2 = -1. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Both these solutions are phenomenologically acceptable in the sense that they permit nontrivial patterns of technifermion condensation, $\langle \bar{T}_L^i T_R^j \rangle$; all technipion and top-pion masses are nonzero; the charged top-pion is heavier than the top quark, so that $t \rightarrow \pi_t^+ b$ does not occur; and there is no large $\pi_T - \pi_t$ mixing so that $t \rightarrow \pi_T^+ b$ is not a problem, even if charged technipions are lighter than the top quark.¹⁴

Although the problem of $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing raised by Kominis was not known to us when we wrote Ref. [11], the $U(1)$ symmetries of the model discussed there allow only the operator $\mathcal{H}_{l t t b}$ inducing $b_R \longleftrightarrow d_L, s_L$. Thus, $|D_{Lbd}^d| \gg |D_{Rbd}^d|$ and the $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ constraint is satisfied automatically.

In our model,¹¹ the mechanism of topcolor breaking was left unspecified and all technifermions were taken to be $SU(3)_1 \otimes SU(3)_2$ singlets. Thus, the $b_R \longleftrightarrow d_L, s_L$ transition had to be generated by an externally induced term δM_{ETC} in the ETC mass matrix which transforms as $(\bar{3}, 3)$ under the color groups. We then estimated

$$|V_{cb}| \simeq |D_{Lsb}^d| \simeq \frac{\delta m_{sb}}{m_b} \lesssim \frac{\delta m_{sb}}{m_b^{ETC}} \simeq \frac{\delta M_{ETC}^2}{M_s^2}, \tag{5}$$

where m_b is the mass of the b -quark and M_s is the mass of the ETC boson that generates the strange-quark mass, m_s . In a walking technicolor theory,¹⁵

$M_s \gtrsim 100$ TeV. However, we expect $\delta M_{ETC} = \mathcal{O}(1 \text{ TeV})$ because that is the scale at which topcolor breaking naturally occurs. This gives s - b mixing that is about *300 times* too small. This problem is addressed in the rest of this paper. I shall connect generational mixing with topcolor and electroweak symmetry breaking, all of them occurring through technifermion condensation.

5 TC2 Breaking and Generational Mixing

The discussion in this section closely follows that in Ref. [12] with some updating of the model and its discussion.

5.1 Gauge Groups

The gauge groups of interest to us are

$$SU(N) \otimes SU(3)_1 \otimes SU(3)_2 \otimes U(1)_1 \otimes U(1)_2 \otimes SU(2) , \quad (6)$$

where, for definiteness, I have assumed that the technicolor gauge group is $SU(N)$. To help prevent light “axions”, all of these groups (except for the electroweak $SU(2)$ and, possibly, parts of the $U(1)$ ’s) must be embedded in an extended technicolor group, G_{ETC} . I will not specify G_{ETC} . This difficult problem is reserved for the future. However, as above, I will assume the existence of ETC-induced four-fermion operators which are needed to break quark, lepton and technifermion chiral symmetries. Of course, these operators must be invariant under the groups in Eq. 6.

5.2 $U(1)_1 \otimes U(1)_2$ Breaking

In order that top-quark condensation occur without unnatural fine-tuning, the extra Z' resulting from $U(1)_1 \otimes U(1)_2$ breaking must have a mass of at most a few TeV. Unlike the simple model of Ref. [11], the topcolor-breaking scenario described here seems to require that Z' couples strongly to light, as well as heavy, quarks and leptons. Then, two conditions are necessary to prevent conflict with neutral current experiments. First, there must be a Z^0 boson with standard electroweak couplings to all quarks and leptons. To arrange this, there will be a hierarchy of symmetry breaking scales, with $U(1)_1 \otimes U(1)_2 \rightarrow U(1)_Y$ at 1–2 TeV, followed by $SU(2) \otimes U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{EM}$ at the lower electroweak scale Λ_{EW} . Assuming that technicolor interactions induce both symmetry breakdowns, the technifermions responsible for $U(1)_1 \otimes U(1)_2 \rightarrow U(1)_Y$ —call them ψ_L and ψ_R —must belong to a *vectorial* repre-

sentation of $SU(2)$ and to a *higher-dimensional* representation of $SU(N)$.^c Technifermions responsible for $SU(2) \otimes U(1)_Y$ breaking will be assumed to belong to fundamental representations of $SU(N)$.^d

The second constraint is that the Z' should not induce large flavor-changing interactions. This may be achieved if the $U(1)_1$ couplings of the two light generations are GIM-symmetric. Then flavor-changing effects will nominally be of order $|V_{ub}|^2/M_{Z'}^2$ for $\Delta B_d = 2$ processes, $|V_{cb}|^2/M_{Z'}^2$ for $\Delta B_s = 2$, and negligibly small for $\Delta S = 2$. These should be within experimental limits.

5.3 $SU(3)_1 \otimes SU(3)_2$ and Electroweak Breaking and Generational Mixing

The fact that b_R transforms as $(3, 1, 1; -\frac{1}{3})$ under $SU(3)_1 \otimes SU(3)_2 \otimes SU(2) \otimes U(1)_Y$ while d_L, s_L transforms as $(1, 3, 2; \frac{1}{6})$ suggests that the mechanism connecting d_L, s_L to b_R may also be responsible for breaking $SU(3)_1 \otimes SU(3)_2 \rightarrow SU(3)$ and $SU(2) \otimes U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{EM}$. Since the generational mixing term transforms as $(\bar{3}, 3)$ under the color groups, I introduce colored technifermion isodoublets transforming under $SU(N) \otimes SU(3)_1 \otimes SU(3)_2 \otimes SU(2)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{L(R)}^1 &= \begin{pmatrix} U^1 \\ D^1 \end{pmatrix}_{L(R)} \in (N, 3, 1, 2(1)) \\ T_{L(R)}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} U^2 \\ D^2 \end{pmatrix}_{L(R)} \in (N, 1, 3, 2(1)). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The transition $d_L, s_L \longleftrightarrow D_L^2 \longleftrightarrow D_R^1 \longleftrightarrow b_R$ occurs if the appropriate ETC operator exists and if the condensate $\langle \bar{T}_L^1 T_R^2 \rangle$ forms.

The patterns of technifermion condensation, $\langle \bar{T}_L^i T_R^j \rangle$, that do occur depend on the strength of the interactions driving them and on explicit chiral symmetry breaking (4T) interactions that determine the correct chiral-perturbative ground state, i.e., “align the vacuum”.¹⁷ The strong interactions driving technifermion condensation are $SU(N)$, $SU(3)_1$ and $U(1)_1$. Technicolor does not prefer any particular form for $\langle \bar{T}_L^i T_R^j \rangle$; $SU(3)_1$ drives $\langle \bar{T}_L^1 T_R^1 \rangle \neq 0$; $U(1)_1$ drives $\langle \bar{T}_L^1 T_R^1 \rangle$, $\langle \bar{T}_L^2 T_R^2 \rangle \neq 0$ or $\langle \bar{T}_L^1 T_R^2 \rangle \neq 0$, depending on the strong hypercharge assignments.

^cTo simplify the analysis, I make the minimal assumption that the $\psi_{L,R}$ are electrically neutral $SU(2)$ singlets.

^dThis is reminiscent of multiscale technicolor¹⁶ but, there, both the higher and fundamental representations participate in electroweak symmetry breaking. In the present model, I shall assume that $\psi_{L,R}$ belong to the $\frac{1}{2}N(N-1)$ -dimensional antisymmetric tensor representation. I also assume that this set of technifermions is large enough to ensure that the technicolor coupling “walks” for a large range of momenta.¹⁵

In the approximation that technicolor interactions dominate condensate formation, so that

$$\langle \bar{T}_L^i T_R^j \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta_T U_{ij} \quad (i, j = 1, 2), \quad (8)$$

the following is easily proved: If $T^1 \in (3, 1)$ and $T^2 \in (1, 3)$ are the only technifermions and if the vacuum-aligning interactions are $SU(3)_1 \otimes SU(3)_2$ symmetric then, in each charge sector, the unitary matrix $U_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$ or $U_{ij} = (i\sigma_2)_{ij}$, but *not* a nontrivial combination of the two. The diagonal form of U is needed to ensure that certain technipions get mass. The nondiagonal form is needed to break topcolor and mix the heavy and light generations (with $\delta m_{sb} \sim \langle \bar{T}^1 T^2 \rangle_{M_s} / M_s^2 \sim m_s$). Therefore, in order that both types of symmetry breaking occur, i.e., $U = a_0 1 + ia_2 \sigma_2$, it will be necessary to introduce additional technifermions to complicate the vacuum alignment. We shall take these to be $(N, 1, 1, 2(1))$ under $SU(N) \otimes SU(3)_1 \otimes SU(3)_2 \otimes SU(2)$.

5.4 A New Model

The model presented here is an improvement on the one published in Ref. [12] and presented at SCGT 96. That model had a strong axial-vector coupling of the electron to the Z' boson. This is excluded by measurements of parity violation in cesium atoms unless $M_{Z'} \gtrsim 20 \text{ TeV}$.¹⁸ But such a large Z' mass cannot play an important role in top-quark condensation without unnatural fine-tuning. Therefore, the model of Ref. [12] must be rejected.

In the new model, the electron has a purely vectorial coupling to the Z' so that its mass can be as low as 2–3 TeV and still be consistent with precision electroweak measurements.¹⁹ Unfortunately, this model and all other models of this type that I have constructed have at least one extra triplet of massless Nambu-Goldstone bosons in addition to the longitudinal $W_L^\pm, Z_L^0$.^e

The fermions in the new model, their color representations and $U(1)$ charges are listed at the end of this paper in Table 2. A number of choices have been made at the outset to limit and simplify the charges and to achieve the symmetry-breaking scenario's objectives:

- In order that electric charge is conserved by the technifermion condensates, $u_1 + u_2 = v_1 + v_2$, $w_1 + w_2 = w'_1 + w'_2$, $y_1 + y_2 = y'_1 + y'_2$, and $z_1 + z_2 = z'_1 + z'_2$.
- The $U(1)_1$ charges of technifermions respect custodial isospin.

^eThe same was true of the rejected model of Ref. [12]. Since SCGT 96, I have realized that the argument I gave there that there are no extra Nambu-Goldstone bosons is wrong.

- The most important choice for our scenario is that of the $U(1)_1$ charges of T^1 and T^2 . So long as $u_1 \neq v_1$, the broken $U(1)_1$ interactions favor condensation of T^1 with T^2 . If this interaction is stronger than the $SU(3)_1$ -attraction for T^1 with itself and if we neglect other vacuum-aligning ETC interactions, then $\langle \bar{T}_L^i T_R^j \rangle \propto (i\sigma_2)_{ij}$ in each charge sector. In the extreme walking-technicolor limit that the anomalous dimensions of $\langle \bar{T}_L^i T_R^j \rangle$ are equal to one, this condition is $\alpha_{Z'}(u_1 - v_1)^2 > 4\alpha_{V_8}/3$, where $\alpha_{Z'} = g_1'^2/4\pi$ and $\alpha_{V_8} = g_1^2/4\pi$. The proof of this is presented in Ref. [12].
- I must choose $Y_1(t_R) = d' \neq Y_1(b_R) = d''$ to prevent strong b -condensation. For simplicity, I took $Y_1 = b' = b''$ for all right-handed light quarks. We shall see that solutions to the hypercharge equations allow dd' to be positive and greater than dd'' , as it must be in order that top quarks condense and bottom quarks don't.
- For the $SU(N)$ antisymmetric tensor ψ , $\xi' \neq \xi$ guarantees $U(1)_1 \otimes U(1)_2 \rightarrow U(1)_Y$ when $\langle \bar{\psi}_L \psi_R \rangle$ forms. Note that, if $N = 4$, a single real ψ_L is sufficient to break the $U(1)$'s. Otherwise, to limit the parameters, $\xi' = -\xi$ may be assumed.

To give mass to quarks and leptons, I assume the ETC operators:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\ell}_{iL} \gamma^\mu T_L^l \bar{D}_R^l \gamma_\mu e_{jR} &\implies a - a' = x_1 - x'_1 = 0 \\
\bar{q}_{iL}^l \gamma^\mu T_L^q \bar{T}_R^q \gamma_\mu q_{jR}^l &\implies b - b' = b - b'' = w_1 - w'_1 \\
\bar{q}_L^b \gamma^\mu T_L^t \bar{U}_R^t \gamma_\mu t_R &\implies d - d' = y_1 - y'_1 \\
\bar{q}_L^b \gamma^\mu T_L^b \bar{D}_R^b \gamma_\mu b_R &\implies d - d'' = z_1 - z'_1 .
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The first condition guarantees a vectorial electron coupling to the Z' , up to small mixing effects. To generate $d_L, s_L \longleftrightarrow b_R$, I require the operator

$$\bar{q}_{iL}^l \gamma^\mu T_L^2 \bar{D}_R^1 \gamma_\mu b_R \implies b - d' = 0 . \tag{10}$$

To suppress $d_R, s_R \longleftrightarrow b_L$, ETC interactions must not generate the operator $\bar{q}_L^b \gamma^\mu T_L^1 \bar{D}_R^2 \gamma_\mu d_{iR}$. This operator is forbidden by $U(1)$ interactions if

$$d - b' \neq 0 . \tag{11}$$

This constraint will turn out to follow from the required existence of other four-fermion operators and certain no-anomaly constraints. Thus, this operator does not appear without the intervention of $U(1)_1$ breaking and so the

transition $d_R, s_R \longleftrightarrow b_L$ is automatically suppressed relative to $d_L, s_L \longleftrightarrow b_R$ by a factor of $\delta M_{ETC}^2/M_s^2 = \mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$. There should be no problem in this model with $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing.¹⁰

The longitudinal components of the weak bosons will be the model's only massless Nambu-Goldstone bosons if ETC and $U(1)_1$ interactions (including the operator $\bar{q}_L^h \gamma^\mu T_L^t \bar{U}_R^t \gamma_\mu t_R$) explicitly break all spontaneously broken chiral symmetries except $SU(2) \otimes U(1)_Y$. For this, it is necessary that every T_L^i and T_R^i appear in at least one term of the chiral-symmetry-breaking Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}'$.^f

I have not yet succeeded in building a model which allows enough 4T operators to break all chiral symmetries. In the model presented here, one maximal set of operators allowed by $U(1)_1$ and $U(1)_2$ interactions and consistent with the condition $u_1 - v_1 \neq 0$ required for $\langle \bar{T}_L^1 T_R^2 \rangle \neq 0$ is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{T}_L^1 \gamma^\mu T_L^t \bar{T}_R^t \gamma_\mu T_R^1 &\implies y_1 - y'_1 = u_1 - v_1 \\
\bar{T}_L^2 \gamma^\mu T_L^l \bar{T}_R^l \gamma_\mu T_R^2 &\implies y'_1 - x_1 = u_1 - v_1 \\
\bar{T}_L^l \gamma^\mu T_L^t \bar{T}_R^b \gamma_\mu T_R^l &\implies y_1 - z'_1 = y_2 - z'_2 = 0 \\
\bar{T}_L^q \gamma^\mu T_L^t \bar{T}_R^l \gamma_\mu T_R^q &\implies w_1 - w'_1 = y_1 - x_1 .
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Note that these operators imply the equal-charge conditions

$$x_1 + x_2 = y_1 + y_2 = z_1 + z_2 . \tag{13}$$

These operators (and any generated by diagonal ETC interactions or Z' exchange) leave $\sum_{i \neq b} \bar{T}_L^i \gamma_\mu \sigma^a T_L^i$ and $\bar{T}_L^b \gamma_\mu \sigma^a T_L^b$ separately conserved.

The requirement that gauge anomalies cancel constrains $U(1)$ charge assignments. Taking account of the equal-charge conditions, there are five inde-

^fThe proof of this statement—which applies to the $\mathcal{H}'$ obtained after vacuum alignment—makes use of the fact that the vector flavor symmetry charges Q^a annihilate the standard chiral-perturbative vacuum $|\Omega\rangle$, and, so, axial charges Q_5^a may be replaced by left- and/or right-handed charges in using Dashen's theorem.¹⁷ If T_L^i appears only in $SU(2) \otimes U(1)_Y$ -invariant terms of the form $\bar{T}_L^i \gamma_\mu T_L^i \dots$, there will be three additional NGBs, two charged and one neutral. If T_R^i appears only in terms of the form $\dots \bar{T}_R^i \gamma_\mu (a + b\sigma_3) T_R^i$, with $b \neq 0$, the charged NGBs acquire mass, but the neutral one remains massless.

pendent conditions which are linear in the hypercharges:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underline{U(1)_{1,2}[SU(N)]^2} : \\
& \quad w_1 - w'_1 + y_1 - y'_1 + z_1 - z'_1 = -\frac{1}{2}(N-2)(\xi - \xi') \\
& \underline{U(1)_{1,2}[SU(3)_1]^2} : \\
& \quad 2d - d' - d'' = -2N(u_1 - v_1) \\
& \underline{U(1)_{1,2}[SU(3)_2]^2} : \\
& \quad 2b - b' - b'' = N(u_1 - v_1) \\
& \underline{U(1)_{1,2}[SU(2)]^2} : \\
& \quad 3(a + 2b + d) = -N[3(u_1 + v_1) + w_1 + x_1 + y_1 + z_1] \\
& \quad \quad \quad = N[3(u_2 + v_2) + w_2 + x_2 + y_2 + z_2] .
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

There are four anomaly conditions that are cubic in the hypercharges. However, the $U(1)_Y[SU(2)]^2$ anomaly cancellation guarantees that the $[U(1)_Y]^3$ anomaly also cancels, leaving three independent conditions. Their most convenient form is:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underline{[U(1)_1]^3} : \\
& \quad 0 = 3[a^3 + 2(2b^3 - b'^3 - b''^3) + 2d^3 - d'^3 - d''^3] \\
& \quad \quad + \frac{1}{2}N(N-1)(\xi^3 - \xi'^3) + 2N(w_1^3 - w'_1{}^3 + y_1^3 - y'_1{}^3 + z_1^3 - z'_1{}^3) \\
& \underline{[U(1)_1]^2 U(1)_Y} : \\
& \quad 0 = 2(b^2 - 2b'^2 + b''^2) + d^2 - 2d'^2 + d''^2 \\
& \quad \quad + 2N[(w_1 + w_2)(w_1^2 - w'_1{}^2) + (y_1 + y_2)(y_1^2 - y'_1{}^2) + (z_1 + z_2)(z_1^2 - z'_1{}^2)] \\
& \underline{[U(1)_1]^3 + [U(1)_2]^3 - 3[U(1)_1]^2 U(1)_Y} : \\
& \quad 0 = 2N\left\{(w'_1 - w_1)\left[(w_1 + w_2)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\right] + (y'_1 - y_1)\left[(y_1 + y_2)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\right] \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + (z'_1 - z_1)\left[(z_1 + z_2)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\right]\right\} + 2(b' - b) + d' - d .
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Together with Eqs. 9, 10 and 12, the linear anomaly conditions imply

$$\begin{aligned}
N &= 4 \\
b - b' &= b - b'' = w_1 - w'_1 = y_1 - x_1 = \frac{1}{2}N(u_1 - v_1) \\
d - d' &= y_1 - y'_1 = u_1 - v_1 \\
d - d'' &= z_1 - z'_1 = -(2N + 1)(u_1 - v_1) \\
(N - 2)(\xi - \xi') &= 3N(u_1 - v_1) .
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The surprising requirement that $N = 4$ follows from $u_1 - v_1 = y'_1 - x_1 = y'_1 - y_1 + y_1 - x_1 = -(u_1 - v_1) + \frac{1}{2}N(u_1 - v_1)$. Note that $b' = b''$ and $b = d''$ imply that $\bar{q}_L^h \gamma^\mu T_L^1 \bar{D}_R^2 \gamma_\mu d_{iR}$ is not allowed by $U(1)$ interactions:

$$b'' - d = b' - b + d'' - d = \frac{1}{2}(3N + 1)(u_1 - v_1) \neq 0 , \tag{17}$$

so long as $u_1 - v_1 \neq 0$.

As in Ref. [12], I sought numerical solutions to the cubic anomaly equations as follows: Requiring $u = \frac{1}{2}(u_1 - v_1) \neq 0$, I set $\xi' = -\xi = 3Nu/(N - 2)$. Then, choosing values for w_1 , y_1 , $y_1 + y_2$ and d , I solved for u , a and $w_1 + w_2$. As a fairly random example, the choice $N = 4$ and $w_1 = 1.00$, $y_1 = 1.00$, $y_1 + y_2 = 0$ (which implies $(w_1 + w_2) = \pm \frac{7}{16}$), and $d = 1.00$ lead to the solutions

$$\begin{aligned}
u &= -0.02691, \quad a = -1.6983, \quad d' = 1.0538, \quad d'' = 0.5156 \\
(w_1 + w_2 &= -\sqrt{\frac{7}{16}})
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
u &= -0.2100, \quad a = -6.0867, \quad d' = 1.4200, \quad d'' = -2.7796 \\
(w_1 + w_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{7}{16}})
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Note that $dd' > dd''$ for both solutions. The lower limits on $M_{Z'}$ for the first solution is $M_{Z'} = 2.7 \text{ TeV}$.¹⁹ It is three times larger for the second one, requiring fine-tuning of the $U(1)_1$ coupling. Even worse, the value $a \simeq -6$ is so large that lepton condensates should form! A more thorough search will turn up many more solutions, some acceptable, some not. What is needed in this class of models is a solution to the problem of massless technipions and, more generally, a careful study of the vacuum alignment problem.

6 Conclusions

Topcolor-assisted technicolor is now the most promising *natural* approach to a dynamical explanation for electroweak symmetry breaking and all quark and lepton masses and mixing parameters. The most economical scheme for breaking electroweak and topcolor gauge symmetries *and* connecting the heavy and light generations would seem to involve technicolor and topcolor interactions alone. Here, I have outlined a scenario to implement that. As we have moved deeper into this scenario, several hurdles have appeared in our course. More work is needed to know if these are show-stoppers. Clever ideas are needed to advance the whole TC2 approach. More than anything, experimental data are needed to show us the way to a more complete picture. Some of the phenomenological questions which experiments can address are discussed by Estia Eichten in his talk at this workshop.²⁰

Acknowledgments

I extend warm thanks to the SCGT 96 organizers, especially Koichi Yamawaki and Masako Bando, for an excellent workshop, gracious hospitality, and the opportunity to visit Japan, see a few of its many sights, meet some very nice people, and eat some really wonderful food. The research reported here was supported in part by the Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG02-91ER40676.

References

1. C. T. Hill, *Phys. Lett. B* **345**, 483 (1995).
2. C. T. Hill, "Topcolor", Fermilab-Conf-97/032-T, invited talk at SCGT 96.
3. Y. Nambu, in *New Theories in Physics*, Proceedings of the XI International Symposium on Elementary Particle Physics, Kazimierz, Poland, 1988, edited by Z. Adjuk, S. Pokorski and A. Trautmann (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989); Enrico Fermi Institute Report EFI 89-08 (unpublished); V. A. Miransky, M. Tanabashi and K. Yamawaki, *Phys. Lett. B* **221**, 171 (1989); *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **4**, 1043 (1989); W. A. Bardeen, C. T. Hill and M. Lindner, *Phys. Rev. D* **D41**, 1647 (1990).
4. C. T. Hill, *Phys. Lett. B* **266**, 419 (1991); S. P. Martin, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 4283 (1992); *ibid* **D46**, 2197 (1992); *Nucl. Phys. B* **398**, 359 (1993); M. Lindner and D. Ross, *Nucl. Phys. B* **B370**, 30 (1992); R. Bönisch, *Phys. Lett. B* **268**, 394 (1991); C. T. Hill, D. Kennedy, T. Onogi, H. L. Yu, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 2940 (1993).

5. S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. D* **19**, 1277 (1979); L. Susskind, *Phys. Rev. D* **20**, 2619 (1979).
6. S. Dimopoulos and L. Susskind, *Nucl. Phys. B* **155**, 237 (1979).
7. E. Eichten and K. Lane, *Phys. Lett. B* **90**, 125 (1980).
8. F. Abe, et al., The CDF Collaboration, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 225 (1994); *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 2966 (1994); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 2626 (1995); S. Abachi, et al., The DØ Collaboration, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 2632 (1995).
9. R. S. Chivukula, B. A. Dobrescu and J. Terning, *Phys. Lett. B* **353**, 289 (1995).
10. D. Kominis, *Phys. Lett. B* **358**, 312 (1995); G. Buchalla, G. Burdman, C. T. Hill and D. Kominis, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 5185 (1996).
11. K. Lane and E. Eichten, *Phys. Lett. B* **352**, 382 (1995).
12. K. Lane, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 2204 (1996).
13. R. M. Barnett, et al., The Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 1 (1996).
14. B. Balaji, paper on vacuum alignment in natural TC2, Boston University Preprint BUHEP 96-29, hep-ph/9610446, to appear in Physics Letters B.
15. B. Holdom, *Phys. Rev. D* **24**, 1441 (1981); *Phys. Lett. B* **150**, 301 (1985); T. Appelquist, D. Karabali and L. C. R. Wijewardhana, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 957 (1986); T. Appelquist and L. C. R. Wijewardhana, *Phys. Rev. D* **36**, 568 (1987); K. Yamawaki, M. Bando and K. Matumoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 1335 (1986); T. Akiba and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Lett. B* **169**, 432 (1986).
16. K. Lane and E. Eichten, *Phys. Lett. B* **222**, 274 (1989); K. Lane and M. V. Ramana, *Phys. Rev. D* **44**, 2678 (1991).
17. R. Dashen, *Phys. Rev. D* **3**, 1879 (1971); S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. D* **13**, 974 (1976); E. Eichten, K. Lane and J. Preskill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 225 (1980); K. Lane, *Physica Scripta* **23**, 1005 (1981); M. Peskin, *Nucl. Phys. B* **175**, 197 (1980); J. Preskill, *Nucl. Phys. B* **177**, 21 (1981).
18. R. S. Chivukula and J. Terning, *Phys. Lett. B* **385**, 209 (1996).
19. J. Terning, private communication.
20. E. Eichten, “Low-Energy Signatures for Technicolor”, invited talk at SCGT 96.

Table 2: Lepton, quark and technifermion colors and hypercharges in the model of Sec. 5.

Particle	$SU(3)_1$	$SU(3)_2$	Y_1	Y_2
ℓ_L	1	1	a	$-\frac{1}{2} - a$
e_R, μ_R, τ_R	1	1	a	$-1 - a$
q_L^l	1	3	b	$\frac{1}{6} - b$
c_R, u_R	1	3	b'	$\frac{2}{3} - b'$
d_R, s_R	1	3	b''	$-\frac{1}{3} - b''$
q_L^h	3	1	d	$\frac{1}{6} - d$
t_R	3	1	d'	$\frac{2}{3} - d'$
b_R	3	1	d''	$-\frac{1}{3} - d''$
T_L^1	3	1	u_1	u_2
U_R^1	3	1	v_1	$v_2 + \frac{1}{2}$
D_R^1	3	1	v_1	$v_2 - \frac{1}{2}$
T_L^2	1	3	v_1	v_2
U_R^2	1	3	u_1	$u_2 + \frac{1}{2}$
D_R^2	1	3	u_1	$u_2 - \frac{1}{2}$
T_L^q	1	1	w_1	w_2
U_R^q	1	1	w'_1	$w'_2 + \frac{1}{2}$
D_R^q	1	1	w'_1	$w'_2 - \frac{1}{2}$
T_L^l	1	1	x_1	x_2
U_R^l	1	1	x_1	$x_2 + \frac{1}{2}$
D_R^l	1	1	x_1	$x_2 - \frac{1}{2}$
T_L^t	1	1	y_1	y_2
U_R^t	1	1	y'_1	$y'_2 + \frac{1}{2}$
D_R^t	1	1	y'_1	$y'_2 - \frac{1}{2}$
T_L^b	1	1	z_1	z_2
U_R^b	1	1	z'_1	$z'_2 + \frac{1}{2}$
D_R^b	1	1	z'_1	$z'_2 - \frac{1}{2}$
ψ_L	1	1	ξ	$-\xi$
ψ_R	1	1	ξ'	$-\xi'$